

REMARKS

The office action of May 11, 2006 (Office Action) has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-5, 7-18, 20-22, 27-40, 42, 43 and 46-50 are pending in the application. By this amendment, claims 1, 8, 13, 14, 37-40, 42 and 43 have been amended, new claims 49 and 50 have been added, and claims 6, 23-26, 41, 44 and 45 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Note that claim 13 has been rewritten in independent form to include the subject matter of its base claim. However, claim 13 has not been substantively amended. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Request to renumber the claims

The Office Action requests that claims 20-48 be renumbered as claims 19-47. Applicant respectfully submits that doing so would be improper, because the preliminary amendment filed on May 29, 2001 cancelled claim 19 of the application as originally filed. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 20-48 are correctly numbered and should not be changed.

Claim 13

Applicant notes that claim 13 was not addressed by the Office Action. Applicant respectfully requests consideration and allowance of claim 13. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that, if a subsequent office action is provided that rejects claim 13, it should be a non-final office action to permit the Applicant an opportunity to properly respond thereto.

Claims 1-12, 14-18 and 20-48

Claims 8-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. pat. no. 6,574,469 to Xiang et al. (Xiang). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reason. In order to reject a claim as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102, a single prior art reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention. MPEP § 706.02. As discussed below, Applicants respectfully submit that Xiang clearly fails to teach or imply every aspect of independent claim 8, as amended, and claims 9-12 depending therefrom.

Claims 1-7, 14-18, and 20-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Xiang in view of U.S. pat. no. 5,878,343 to Robert et al. (Robert). As discussed

below, Applicants respectfully submit that Xiang, either alone or in view of Robert, fails to teach or suggest the subject matter of independent claims 1, 8 and 14.

The subject matter of pending claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-18, 20-22, 27-40, 42, 43 and 46-50 pertains to communications devices, methods, networks and systems for performing conferencing. The communications devices generally comprise a first transceiver for communicating in a wireless low power radio frequency network, a second transceiver for communicating in a wireless telecommunications network and a controller. The controller can be configured to control the device to perform conferencing. The controller can be configured to control the device to establish a channel for communication with at least one second communications device in the low power radio frequency network. The second communications device can be operable to communicate in the low power radio frequency network and also in the wireless telecommunications network. The controller can also be configured to control the device to establish a channel for communicating with a destination in the wireless telecommunications network and also to provide a communication link for the at least one second communications device to communicate with the destination by routing a call in the wireless telecommunications network through the wireless low power radio frequency network to the at least one second communications device.

In contrast, Xiang relates to a system, method and gateway for minimizing the number of transcodings of a speech signal during a conference call. Xiang discloses each subscriber being connected to an IP-based network via a gateway. Subscribers can participate in a conference call via the IP based network. Each subscriber is connected to the IP-based network via a gateway and speech signals between the subscribers and the gateways are encoded. The gateways can send messages to other gateways so that when a conference call is in place a first gateway can encode the call signals with the appropriate coding for the other gateways before transmitting the message over the IP-based network.

Xiang does not disclose a communications device comprising a first transceiver for communicating in a first radio communications network and a second transceiver for communicating in a second different radio communications network. Xiang discloses mobile stations 11, 15 and 19 and telephone, 23 which are connected to an IP based network via respective gateways. There is no disclosure that any of these devices comprise first transceiver

and a second transceiver, nor is there a disclosure that any of these devices are operable to communicate in two different radio communications networks.

Furthermore, Xiang does not disclose a communications device being operable to perform conferencing by establishing two channels, one in a first radio communications network to a second communications device and one in a second different radio communications network, and enabling the second communications device to communicate in the second network via these channels. Xiang only discloses using a single IP-based network for conferencing. In Xiang each of the devices performs conferencing by connecting to this network via a gateway. There is no disclosure of one device establishing a channel with another of the devices in order to enable communication in the IP-based network.

Robert fails to overcome the deficiencies of Xiang with respect to claims 1-5, 7, 14-18, 20-22, 27-40, 42, 43 and 46-48. Robert discloses an arrangement for interconnecting a first communication system and a second communication system. The first communication system is a cellular mobile communication system such as a GSM system and the second communication system is a cordless access system such as the DECT system. The systems are connected via an interworking function which interworks signaling protocols between the two systems.

Robert does not disclose a communications device comprising a first transceiver for communicating in a first radio communications network and a second transceiver for communicating in a second different radio communications network. Although Robert discloses devices that are operable in two different systems, namely a GSM system and a DECT system, it does not disclose a device having different transceiver means for each of the two networks.

Furthermore Robert does not disclose a device operable for performing conferencing. Robert only relates to methods of handing over between two different networks and does not disclose using those networks to perform conferencing.

Robert also does not disclose a device operable to establish two channels, one in a first radio communications network to a second communications device and one in a second different radio communications network, and enable the second communications device to communicate in the second network via these channels.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Xiang, either alone or in view of Robert, fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention. Neither of the

prior art documents even relate to enabling conference calls using two different networks. As such, there is no teaching in either of the prior art documents which would suggest modifying the disclosure of the prior art so as to produce the claimed invention.

For at least the above mentioned reasons, Applicant maintains that the present invention is both new and non-obvious with respect to the cited prior art. In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8 and 14 are allowable over Xiang, either alone or in combination with Robert. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that pending dependent claims 2-5, 7, 9-12, 15-18, 20-22, 27-40, 42, 43 and 46-48, which depend from one of independent claims 1, 8 or 14, are allowable along with their respective base claim and further in view of novel features recited therein.

New claims 49 and 50

Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 49 and 50 are allowable over the cited prior art for similar reasons to those discussed above and further in view of the novel features recited therein.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: October 11, 2006

By: /Anthony W. Kandare/
Anthony W. Kandare, reg. no. 48,830

1001 G Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20001-4597
Telephone: (202) 824-3000
Facsimile: (202) 824-3001